

Volusia County Schools

Discovery Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	23

Discovery Elementary School

975 ABAGAIL DR, Deltona, FL 32725

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/discovery/pages/default.aspx>

Demographics

Principal: Jennifer Dietz

Start Date for this Principal: 7/20/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Volusia County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	23

Discovery Elementary School

975 ABAGAIL DR, Deltona, FL 32725

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/discovery/pages/default.aspx>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	89%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	57%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Volusia County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Everyone, Everyday, In Some Way is a Winner at Discovery Elementary.
We believe all students will learn and develop academically, behaviorally, and socially to achieve success in school.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The quest of Discovery Elementary is to create a cooperative learning atmosphere that stimulates the awakening of each student's potential while encouraging an environment of mutual respect and community pride.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
McLean, Leslie	Principal	Leadership focus, guidance and coaching to staff creating professional growth opportunities which will positively impact student achievement. School performance monitoring through data driven indicators classroom walk-thrus with timely feedback and observations allowing for change and impact of change to be evident.
Falk, Paul	Instructional Coach	Leadership focus, guidance and coaching to staff creating professional growth opportunities which will positively impact student achievement. School performance monitoring through data driven indicators classroom walk-thrus with timely feedback and coaching sessions allowing for change and impact of change to be evident.
Lemelin, Melissa	Teacher, K-12	ELA intervention support providing up to date & relevant opportunities to enhance professional content delivery with peer collaboration, co-teaching opportunities & in classroom student academic supports.
Mendoza, Amaris	Teacher, K-12	ESOL team providing in classroom student supports and teacher content supports via delivery accommodations, and professional collaboration opportunities during PLC & planning to ensure student engagement and relevant conceptual academics.
Griggs, Amanda	Teacher, K-12	ELA intervention support providing up to date & relevant opportunities to enhance professional content delivery with peer collaboration, co-teaching opportunities & in classroom student academic supports.
McGahan, Lynn	Teacher, ESE	ESE team providing in classroom student supports and teacher content supports via delivery accommodations, and professional collaboration opportunities during PLC & planning to ensure student engagement and relevant conceptual academics.
Martin, April	Instructional Coach	Reading Intervention and Reading Coach

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/20/2019, Jennifer Dietz

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

14

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

34

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

41

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems**Current Year**

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	97	92	91	74	84	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	533
Attendance below 90 percent	20	14	10	9	11	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
One or more suspensions	4	5	11	3	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	33	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	1	2	0	13	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 6/16/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	96	105	76	98	96	110	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	581
Attendance below 90 percent	3	1	1	17	2	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
One or more suspensions	3	1	1	9	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	55	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	3	1	1	20	9	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	17	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	1	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

Prior Year - Updated**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	96	105	76	98	96	110	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	581
Attendance below 90 percent	3	1	1	17	2	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
One or more suspensions	3	1	1	9	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	55	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	3	1	1	20	9	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	17	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	1	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**School Data**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	46%	56%	57%	47%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	56%	58%	46%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	46%	53%	47%	44%	52%
Math Achievement	43%	59%	63%	48%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	43%	56%	62%	51%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	30%	43%	51%	49%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	41%	57%	53%	43%	59%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	42%	58%	-16%	58%	-16%
	2018	53%	56%	-3%	57%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	49%	54%	-5%	58%	-9%
	2018	44%	54%	-10%	56%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2019	46%	54%	-8%	56%	-10%
	2018	46%	51%	-5%	55%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	30%	60%	-30%	62%	-32%
	2018	47%	58%	-11%	62%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		-17%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	58%	59%	-1%	64%	-6%
	2018	58%	60%	-2%	62%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				
05	2019	35%	54%	-19%	60%	-25%
	2018	45%	57%	-12%	61%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		-23%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	39%	56%	-17%	53%	-14%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	39%	56%	-17%	55%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	15	29	46	11	12	5	5				
ELL	37	52	56	29	36	33	30				
BLK	33	50		36	43		18				
HSP	44	52	44	34	39	31	41				
MUL	59			56							
WHT	50	51	39	49	45	27	47				
FRL	44	51	40	41	44	33	39				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	28	46	47	28	50	57	21				
ELL	31	43	39	32	49	60	21				
BLK	36	44		45	72		21				
HSP	46	49	43	42	52	43	37				
MUL	75			75							
WHT	52	50	48	60	67	62	48				
FRL	47	50	47	49	61	53	38				
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	20	44	33	26	43	42	24				
ELL	33	50	50	37	53	48	7				
BLK	24	47	64	36	57	60	27				
HSP	49	43	41	48	49	54	40				
MUL	64			55							
WHT	48	48	46	49	49	35	55				
FRL	46	44	48	47	51	52	41				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	62
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	360
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	21
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	42
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	36
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	44
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Hispanic Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	58
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	44
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	44
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Since there was no FSA assessment during the 2019-2020 academic year, Discovery is using the 2018-2019 FSA scores to prepare for 2020-2021 academic year. In 2018-2019 the 3rd grade scores dropped 17 proficiency points in math and 11 proficiency points in ELA. This 3rd grade group is now our 5th graders. Last year, this group consistently scored in the LQ for district assessments.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

The 3rd grade trend dropped 17 proficiency points in math from the year before, and that trend continued in this year's 4th grade based on district math assessments and i-Ready Data. One contributing factor for the decline in scores was our 3rd grade team was inexperienced and some had medical issues and there was a long term sub in one of those classrooms. In addition, there were

concerns about the testing environment. Finally, there were classroom management issues requiring students to miss substantial amounts of instructional time.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

In 2018-2019, 3rd grade FSA ELA data was 16% lower compared to the state average and their FSA math data was 32% lower than the state average. The staffing issues in the 2018-2019 school year was the major contributing factor for the decline of scores for that grade level.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

In 2018-2019 the 4th grade ELA scores improved from 44 to 49 percent based on the schools' decision to restructure the 4th grade team. This team included several experienced teachers some of which had an ESE background.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Our current 4th graders and next year's 5th graders have an alarming percentage (over 35%) of the students scoring Level 1 on either ELA/math or both. That same group has the largest number of students with two or more indicators on the EWS. Furthermore, due to the pandemic some of these students will return to school with a significantly larger gap then when they left for Spring Break.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. Standards based ELA instruction to improve achievement in this category-with focus on the following ESSA subgroups-ESE, BLK, and LQ
2. Standards based math instruction to improve achievement in this category-with focus on the following ESSA subgroups-ESE, BLK, and LQ
3. Standards based science instruction to improve achievement in this category-with focus on the following ESSA subgroups-ESE, BLK, and LQ
4. Intervention with fidelity in ELA, math, and science instruction to include at risk ESSA subgroups and LQ
5. Since students have been out of school for 5 months due to the pandemic, Discovery will address their emotional, social, and mental health needs through SEL and PBIS

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Student performance for all grades in ELA at Discovery are trending down as are District and State performance. Student performance on the ELA portion of the FSA shows only 42% of Discovery students were demonstrating proficiency in 2019 down from 53% in 2018. In 2018, the ESSA subgroup data showed BLK proficiency as 36%, SWD as 28%, and ELL as 31% proficiency in their individual domains.

Measurable Outcome: Our goal is to increase achievement levels in ELA from 46% to 55%. This is an inclusive score of all sub-groups within the grade levels.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Leslie McLean (lmclean@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Using Ambitious Instructional Strategies: Standards based Instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Discovery selected standards based instruction with clarity because according to John Hattie, it has 0.75 effect size according to his scale.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide grades 3-5 with an ELA intervention teacher
Melissa Lemelin (Intervention Teacher)
2. Common standards based formative/summative assessments administered to determine RTI/ remediation needs
Leslie Mclean and Linda Nigro (Administration); April Martin (Instructional Coach); Melissa Lemelin (Intervention Teacher)
3. Monthly grade level PLC meetings with administration and coaches as facilitators to review data, update school data wall, and lesson planning
Leslie Mclean and Linda Nigro (Administration) and April Martin (Instructional Coach)
4. Grade level planning days with reading coach/district staff support
Leslie Mclean and Linda Nigro (Administration) and April Martin (Instructional Coach)
5. Small group implementation monitoring and support (with inclusive push-in for ESSA subgroups) with the academic team
Leslie Mclean and Linda Nigro (Administration); April Martin (Instructional Coach); Melissa Lemelin (Intervention Teacher)
6. Offer multiple academic and parent nights with Title I funds such as "Literacy Night"
Leslie Mclean and Linda Nigro (Administration)
7. Offer tutoring with Title I funds twice a week before the end of the 1st quarter
Leslie Mclean and Linda Nigro (Administration)
8. Provide a reading intervention teacher through Title I funds and use I-Ready for intervention/enrichment
Leslie Mclean and Linda Nigro (Administration)
9. Reading coach will conduct coaching cycles to ensure implementation of standards-based instruction
Leslie Mclean and Linda Nigro (Administration) and April Martin (Instructional Coach)
10. Conduct learning walks to ensure implementation of standards-based instruction
Leslie Mclean and Linda Nigro (Administration) and April Martin (Instructional Coach)
11. Provide evidence based PD such as: Core Connections, SchoolCity, and teacher selected PD
Leslie Mclean and Linda Nigro (Administration) and April Martin (Instructional Coach)

**Person
Responsible** April Martin (amartin2@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Student performance on the math portion of the FSA shows only 30% of Discovery students were demonstrating proficiency in 2019 down from 47% in 2018. Student performance was 32 proficiency points lower than the state proficiency average rate of 62% and 30 points lower than the district average of 60%.

Measurable Outcome: Discovery's goal is to achieve 50% proficiency in math achievement. This is an inclusive score of all sub-groups within the grade levels.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Leslie McLean (lmclean@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Using Ambitious Instructional Strategies: Standards based Instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Discovery selected standards based instruction with clarity because according to John Hattie, it has 0.75 effect size according to his scale.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Common standards based formative/summative assessments administered to determine RTI/remediation needs
Leslie Mclean and Linda Nigro (Administration); Paul Falk (Instructional Coach); Joy Leader (Math Intervention)
2. Monthly grade level PLC meetings with administration and coaches as facilitators to review data, update data wall, and lesson planning
Leslie Mclean and Linda Nigro (Administration) and Paul Falk (Instructional Coach)
3. Grade level planning days with math coach/district staff support
Leslie Mclean and Linda Nigro (Administration) and Paul Falk (Instructional Coach)
4. Small group implementation monitoring and support (with inclusive push-in for ESSA subgroups) with the academic team
Leslie Mclean and Linda Nigro (Administration); Paul Falk (Instructional Coach); Joy Leader (Math Intervention)
5. Provide evidence-based PD such as: Number Talks, SchoolCity, and teacher selected PD
Leslie Mclean and Linda Nigro (Administration) and Paul Falk (Instructional Coach)
6. Offer tutoring with Title I funds twice a week beginning in October
Leslie Mclean and Linda Nigro (Administration)
7. Provide a math intervention teacher through Title I funds
Leslie Mclean and Linda Nigro (Administration)
8. Math coach will conduct coaching cycles to ensure implementation of standards-based instruction
Leslie Mclean and Linda Nigro (Administration) and Paul Falk (Instructional Coach)
9. Conduct grade level learning walks to ensure implementation of standards-based instruction
Leslie Mclean and Linda Nigro (Administration) and Paul Falk (Instructional Coach)
10. Use I-Ready for intervention and enrichment
Leslie Mclean and Linda Nigro (Administration); Paul Falk (Instructional Coach); Joy Leader (Math Intervention)

Person Responsible: Paul Falk (pcfalk@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. Other specifically relating to ELA and Math Lowest Quartile for the ESE subgroup**Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:**

Student performance data from FSA math scores show 30% proficiency in 2019 down from 54% in 2018. Discovery's ESSA subgroup data showed our SWD dropping from 57% to 5% in math.

Student performance data from FSA reading scores show 43% proficiency in 2019 down from 46% in 2018. Discovery's ESSA subgroup data showed our SWD dropping 47% to 46% in reading.

**Measurable
Outcome:**

Discovery's measurable outcome will increase from 30% to 50%.

**Person
responsible for
monitoring
outcome:**

Leslie McLean (lmclean@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based
Strategy:**

The evidence-based strategy is standards-based instruction.

**Rationale for
Evidence-based
Strategy:**

Discovery selected standards based instruction with clarity because according to John Hattie, it has 0.75 effect size according to his scale.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Bi-weekly grade level ESE PLC meetings with math coach and admin as facilitators to review data and planning
Leslie Mclean and Linda Nigro (Administration) and Paul Falk (Instructional Coach)
2. ESE academic planning days with academic team and/or district staff support
Leslie Mclean and Linda Nigro (Administration); Paul Falk (Instructional Coach); April Martin (Instructional Coach)
3. Small group implementation monitoring and support (with inclusive push-in for ESSA subgroups) with the academic team
Leslie Mclean and Linda Nigro (Administration); Paul Falk (Instructional Coach); April Martin (Instructional Coach)
4. Provide evidence based PD such as: Core Connections, Number Talks, SchoolCity, and teacher selected PD
Leslie Mclean and Linda Nigro (Administration); Paul Falk (Instructional Coach); April Martin (Instructional Coach)
5. Offer tutoring with Title I funds twice a week beginning in October
Leslie Mclean and Linda Nigro (Administration)
6. Provide a math intervention teacher through Title I funds
Leslie Mclean and Linda Nigro (Administration)
7. Math coach will conduct coaching cycles to ensure implementation of standards-based instruction
Leslie Mclean and Linda Nigro (Administration); Paul Falk (Instructional Coach)
8. Conduct ESE learning walks to ensure implementation of standards-based instruction
Leslie Mclean and Linda Nigro (Administration); Paul Falk (Instructional Coach); April Martin (Instructional Coach)
9. Training provided by math coach for all standards based resources
Leslie Mclean and Linda Nigro (Administration); Paul Falk (Instructional Coach)
10. Use I-Ready for intervention and enrichment
Leslie Mclean and Linda Nigro (Administration)

**Person
Responsible**

Paul Falk (pcfalk@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Student performance on the science portion of the FSA for 5th grade has maintained a score of 41% in both 2018 and 2019 which is 16% lower than the district and 12% lower than the state.
Measurable Outcome:	Discovery will earn at least 60% satisfactory rate on FSA science.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Leslie McLean (lmclean@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Using Ambitious Instructional Strategies: Standards based Instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Discovery selected standards based instruction with clarity because according to John Hattie, it has 0.75 effect size according to his scale.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Common standards based formative/summative assessments administered to determine RTI/remediation needs
Leslie Mclean and Linda Nigro (Administration); Paul Falk (Instructional Coach)
2. Weekly grade level PLC meetings with administration and coaches as facilitators to review data and planning
Leslie Mclean and Linda Nigro (Administration); Paul Falk (Instructional Coach)
3. Grade level planning days with math/science coach and district staff support
Leslie Mclean and Linda Nigro (Administration); Paul Falk (Instructional Coach)
5. Teachers will implement/continue "Throw Back Thursday" to review Fair Game science standards from previous grade levels that may be on the state assessment in the spring
Leslie Mclean and Linda Nigro (Administration); Paul Falk (Instructional Coach)
7. Math coach will conduct coaching cycles to ensure implementation of standards-based instruction with clarity
Leslie Mclean and Linda Nigro (Administration); Paul Falk (Instructional Coach)
8. Conduct learning walks to ensure implementation of standards-based instruction
Leslie Mclean and Linda Nigro (Administration); Paul Falk (Instructional Coach)
9. District support will be provided to plan for the throw back Thursdays with Laura Konters from Science helping plan and implement throw back Thursday

Person Responsible Paul Falk (pcfalk@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: During the 2019-2020 school year, Discovery experienced a noticeable increase with students under duress. This resulted in many substantive threat assessments due to high trauma situations that our students experienced. With the early closing of schools because of the COVID-19 pandemic, Discovery expects to see even more students under duress during the 2020-2021 school year. Obviously, when students are in high trauma situations, they miss class time and some miss multiple days from class due to having been admitted to behavioral services. With this in mind, Discovery will reboot its Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports (PBIS) initiative during pre-planning so all teachers can understand and implement Discovery's PBIS strategies to achieve our goal.

Measurable Outcome: By rebooting Discovery's PBIS plan so all teachers can implement PBIS strategies, Discovery will reduce its number of substantive threat assessments by 50% from the 2019-2020 school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Leslie McLean (lmclean@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Discovery will use two main strategies through Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports (PBIS). Response to intervention and classroom behavioral programs such as restorative practices as identified in John Hattie's Visible Learning For Teachers 2012.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: According to John Hattie, response to intervention has an overall effect size of 1.07 and classroom behavioral programs have an overall effect size of 0.68. These are not percentages but references overall academic growth in a school year.

Action Steps to Implement

Reboot of Discovery's school-wide PBIS plan during pre-planning.

Person Responsible Lynn McGahan (lmmcgaha@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Restorative Practice training during identified faculty meetings

Person Responsible Leslie McLean (lmclean@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Implement Student of the week and month- with lunch time celebrations

Person Responsible Lynn McGahan (lmmcgaha@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Build Parent Relationships and reward parents for getting students to school on time

Person Responsible Leslie McLean (lmclean@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

Family & Community Engagement: Discovery will encourage parents and students to participate in school based events such as: award ceremonies, academic nights, inclusion for student data chats, Open House and meet the teacher. Discovery will use a school to community communication plan through our social media platforms and Volusia Connect to help identify upcoming events, campus happenings, and extending invitations to our parents and families

Safe and Supportive Environment: Discovery will continue the use of "buddy classes"; intermediate will be paired with primary classes for a "buddy system". Establish a student government. Expand our academic award ceremonies to include awards for social & emotional characteristics (SEL & PBIS based) which will support school community and other students.

Discovery will also align our students mentally with the SEL & PBIS initiatives to bridge parental and community involvement. Discovery believes by increasing the involvement of the families through SEL, PBIS, and family events, the number of substantive harmful student events will drop and will encourage family supports for student achievement at home.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Discovery has an active SAC which includes members from the community to help drive decisions concerning our programs and students. Discovery offers an Open House and several family nights through the year focusing on reading, math, and science skills. Discovery offers a meet the teacher event before school starts and academic recognition ceremonies throughout the year. Discovery takes part in the Dental Outreach program, has partnerships with Deltona Women's Club, Jewish American Club, and multiple business partners. Our partnership with the local VFW provides opportunities for our students learn about the military and participate in related art contest.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: ELA and Math Lowest Quartile for the ESE subgroup	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00